

of ozena. Other new and important facts were added relative to the biology of this organism. Most important of all is the discovery that the Perez bacillus, hitherto described as non-motile, is a distinctly motile organism, and this fact has greatly simplified the technic of isolation.

The relationship of the *Bacillus bronchisepticus*, the etiologic organism of distemper in dogs, to the Perez bacillus, has, by means of complement fixation phenomenon been definitely proven. This fact and certain other important morphological observations have led these investigators to suggest that the Perez bacillus be now definitely placed with the *Bronchisepticus* group and that the more descriptive title of *Bacillus rhinosepticus* be used.

From a practical standpoint the most important part of the paper was the results of treatment. Vaccines have been prepared and studied in 71 cases with very encouraging results. In many cases, after four to six injections, the odor and crusts completely disappeared. The question of a permanent cure is the question of the ultimate efficiency of vaccine therapy. The only claim that the authors make is that they have in their vaccine, a more efficient method of treatment than any hitherto proposed.

The full text of this paper will appear in the forthcoming issue of the *Annals of Otology*.

#### THE "SCIENTIFIC" AMERICAN.

On a previous occasion we referred to the outpourings of a gentleman by the name of Cyrus L. Topliff (parenthetically, one cannot but wonder if the name is not wrong, and if instead of being Topliff it should be Topnut!) whose card states a connection with the *Scientific American*, but whose lucubrations are, to say the least, peculiar. Quite recently we have received from him a circular entitled "The Cancer Problem," with a little digest of it for hasty editorial use. The following is the digest of Mr. Topliff's remarks, addressed largely to the medical profession and which, we are quite certain, our readers will find entertaining if not amusing. One wonders, sort of casually, whether Mr. Topliff is any relation to the late Mrs. Eddy:

"This brief article contains all that is officially known about cancer, up to the present time.

"It is intended as a suggestion to physicians, and others, to change their present line of thought in regard to this disease, and make a careful study of the mind, and its relations with the body.

"If fear, worry, hate, spite, jealousy, and all irritating thoughts, were entirely eliminated from the mind, then cancer, and all inflammatory forms of disease, would probably not develop in the body; and cases where the disease is already present, if not too far advanced, could, no doubt, be cured.

"If people could be led to think on these lines, more curative results would follow, not only in the treatment of cancer, but in all other forms of disease."

#### ADVERTISING.

Fifteen or more years ago, we began debating the subject of proper and improper advertising. Continuously from November, 1902, the claim was made by this JOURNAL and its Editor that there is not only a moral but a legal responsibility attaching to advertising things which are either fraudulent in themselves, improperly advertised, or advertised with an intent to get money in illegitimate ways, or to sell things which the purchaser would not or might not be able to use, or which would be worthless or without benefit to him.

Quite recently the Supreme Court of the United States has finally decided this question in practically exactly this way. It holds that even though the article sold may be actually worth the price to be obtained for it, still it might be so advertised as to work a fraud or injury upon the purchaser. In part the decision says: "An article alone is not necessarily the inducement and compensation for its purchase. It is in the use to which it may be put, the purpose it may serve; and there is deception and fraud when the article is not of the character or kind represented and hence does not serve the purpose." A reasonable construction of this decision will undoubtedly be very far reaching in its application to certain forms of patent medicines, cancer cures, and the like. It reverses the old doctrine of *caveat emptor* (let him who buys take care of himself) and substitutes for it *caveat vendor* (let him who sells be careful).

#### THE HARRISON LAW.

Considerable discussion and not a little inquiry has been addressed to us in regard to a recent decision of the Supreme Court on one phase of the Harrison Narcotic Law. The case decided by the Supreme Court was the *United States vs. Jin Fuey Mor*. The *Journal of the American Medical Association* has referred to this decision two or three times; in the issues for June 17 and 24, and July 1, 1916, will be found items relating to it. In brief it may be said that the decision does not in any way alter the relations of the medical profession to the Harrison Law. The decision is merely to the effect that persons not mentioned in the law may have in their possession quantities of the proscribed drugs. To this extent it decreases the usefulness of the law, because it removes from the jurisdiction of that particular law the very class which it was most desired to reach. The Supreme Court had a hard problem to settle. It is notoriously a fact that the passage of this law by Congress on the basis of an act for the purpose of raising revenue, was a cheerful fiction, but it was the only basis on which Congress could enact such a law. The Supreme Court could not consider this as a fiction, but was compelled to consider the law as one passed by Congress for the purpose of raising revenue and therefore applying only to certain specified classes of citizens.